

ON LINDENSTRAUSS-PEŁCZYŃSKI SPACES

JESÚS M. F. CASTILLO, YOLANDA MORENO AND JESÚS SUÁREZ

ABSTRACT. In this work we shall be concerned with some stability aspects of the classical problem of extension of $C(K)$ -valued operators. We introduce the class $\mathcal{LP}$ of Banach spaces of Lindenstrauss-Pełczyński type as those such that every operator from a subspace of c_0 into them can be extended to c_0 . We show that all $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces are of type $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ but not the converse. Moreover, $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces will be characterized as those spaces E such that E -valued operators from $w^*(l_1, c_0)$ -closed subspaces of l_1 extend to l_1 . Complemented subspaces of $C(K)$ and separably injective spaces are subclasses of $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces and we show that the former does not contain the latter. It is established that $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces not containing l_1 are quotients of $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces, while $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces not containing c_0 , quotients of an $\mathcal{LP}$ -space by a separably injective space and twisted sums of $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces are $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces.

1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

In this work we shall be concerned with some stability aspects of the classical problem of extension of $C(K)$ -valued and $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -valued operators. Let us describe and motivate them. In a 1971 paper [23] Lindenstrauss and Pełczyński proved:

Theorem 1. *Let K be a compact Hausdorff space. Every $C(K)$ -valued operator defined on a subspace of c_0 admits an extension to the whole space.*

The result remained isolated for quite a long time until 1989 when Johnson and Zippin obtained in [14] an extension to subspaces of $c_0(\Gamma)$, and later in 1995, in [15], the analogous result for $w(l_1, c_0)$ -closed subspaces of l_1 . Further proofs of the Lindenstrauss-Pełczyński theorem have been provided by Zippin [32, 33]. The paper [7] contains an homological approach to both results showing that they are in a sense dual one of the other.

The general problem of extension of operators admits a natural formulation in homological terms. We shall assume from the reader some familiarity with the basic notions and constructions of the theory of exact sequences of Banach spaces; the necessary background can be seen in [8] and, operatively defined, below. We shall write $0 \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{j} X \xrightarrow{q} Z \rightarrow 0 \equiv F$ to represent an exact sequence of Banach spaces

The research of the first two authors has been supported in part by DGICYT project MTM2004-02635. The work of the third author was supported in part by a Marie Curie grant HPMT-GH-01-00286-04 at Karlsruhe University under the direction of Prof. L. Weis.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 46B03, 46M99, 46B07.

and operators, which is a diagram where the kernel of each operator coincides with the image of the preceding. The open mapping theorem makes Y a subspace of X through the embedding j and Z the corresponding quotient space through q . The reader can understand that F is just the name of the sequence, which is everything one needs to follow this paper; however, those familiar with the theory of quasi-linear maps created in [16, 17] can in fact consider F as a quasi-linear map associated to the exact sequence.

We shall consider exact sequences of Banach spaces modulus the natural equivalence relationship: two sequences F and G are said to be equivalent if there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{j} & X & \longrightarrow & Z \longrightarrow 0 \equiv F \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow T & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & X' & \longrightarrow & Z \longrightarrow 0 \equiv G. \end{array}$$

In this case we write $F \equiv G$. The space of equivalence classes of exact sequences with Y as subspace and Z as quotient will be denoted $\text{Ext}(Z, Y)$. It is a vector space under some natural operations (see [26]), and the 0 element is the sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Y \oplus Z \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ with inclusion $y \rightarrow (y, 0)$ and quotient map $(y, z) \rightarrow z$. We shall say that F is trivial or splits when $F \equiv 0$. This means, in classical terms, that $j(Y)$ is complemented in X . Recall that a property P is said to be a 3-space property if whenever one has an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ in which both Y and Z have P then also X has P ; see [8] for general information about 3-space problems.

The lower sequence in a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{j} & X & \xrightarrow{q} & Z \longrightarrow 0 \equiv F \\ & & \parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow T \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & X' & \longrightarrow & E \longrightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

is called *pull-back sequence* and naturally denoted FT . The sequence FT splits if and only if T can be lifted to X through q . The lower sequence in a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{j} & X & \longrightarrow & Z \longrightarrow 0 \equiv F \\ & & \downarrow T & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & X' & \longrightarrow & Z \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

is called the *push-out sequence* and naturally denoted TF . Extending an operator $T : Y \rightarrow E$ through j is the same as saying that TF is trivial. The lifting property of $l_1(\Gamma)$ and the fact that every Banach space Z admits an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K(Z) \rightarrow l_1(\Gamma) \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$, called *projective presentation* of Z , yield that every exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ is a push-out of a projective presentation of Z .

Hence $\text{Ext}(Z, Y) = 0$ is equivalent to the statement “every operator $K(Z) \rightarrow Y$ can be extended to $l_1(\Gamma)$ ”.

That all operators $Y \rightarrow E$ can be extended to X through j admits an even simpler formulation: the restriction operator $j^* : \mathcal{L}(X, E) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(Y, E)$ is surjective. The following notation is quite natural and will prove to be very useful:

Definition 1 ($\mathcal{A}$ -trivial exact sequences). *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a class of Banach spaces. We say that an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{j} X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0 \equiv F$ is $\mathcal{A}$ -trivial (or that $\mathcal{A}$ -splits) if for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ the restriction operator $j^* : \mathcal{L}(X, A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(Y, A)$ is surjective.*

Sometimes the quantitative version of the previous notion shall be required: given $\lambda \geq 1$, the exact sequence F will be said to be $(\lambda, \mathcal{A})$ -trivial if for every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ every operator $T : Y \rightarrow A$ admits an extension $\widehat{T} : X \rightarrow A$ such that $\|\widehat{T}\| \leq \lambda\|T\|$.

This notion of $\mathcal{A}$ -triviality unifies different notions appearing in the literature: i) trivial sequences, which correspond with $\mathcal{A} =$ all Banach spaces; ii) Kalton’s *locally trivial*, or locally split, sequences (see [18]), corresponding with $\mathcal{A} = l_\infty(G_n)$, where G_n is a dense (in the Banach-Mazur distance) sequence of finite dimensional Banach spaces (see also [11]); iii) Zippin’s *almost trivial* sequences (see [31, 32, 33, 34]), which correspond with the choice $\mathcal{A} = C(K)$ -spaces.

In this work we are concerned with $C(K)$ -trivial and $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -trivial sequences. In Section 2 we study the stability of $C(K)$ -trivial sequences by amalgams and duality. We first show that l_p and c_0 -amalgams of $C(K)$ -trivial sequences are $C(K)$ -trivial. Regarding stability of $C(K)$ -trivial sequences by duality, the Lindenstrauss-Pełczyński and Johnson-Zippin theorems suggest that it could be that the dual of a $C(K)$ -trivial sequence is $C(K)$ -trivial since the former implies that every exact sequence $0 \rightarrow H \rightarrow X \rightarrow S \rightarrow 0 \equiv F$ in which H is a subspace of c_0 and S separable is $C(K)$ -trivial; and the latter yields (see [9]) that its dual sequence F^* is $C(K)$ -trivial. However, the situation outlined by those two theorems proves to be quite peculiar; we give examples at the end of Section 2 which show that the dual and bidual sequences of a $C(K)$ -trivial sequence need not to be $C(K)$ -trivial.

In Section 3 our attention turns to those Banach spaces which can play the role of $C(K)$ -spaces in the Lindenstrauss-Pełczyński theorem. We give to such spaces the name of Lindenstrauss-Pełczyński ($\mathcal{LP}$, in short) spaces. Our motivation to introduce those spaces comes from [23, remark 2, p.234] in which Lindenstrauss and Pełczyński assert that isometric L_1 -preduals can play the role of $C(K)$ -spaces regarding extension of operators from subspaces of c_0 . After showing that every $\mathcal{LP}$ -space is an $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ space we then face the unavoidable question: Must every $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -space be an $\mathcal{LP}$ -space? The answer is no, which solves Problem 6.15 of Zippin in [34]. We shall show that the same approach with respect to the Johnson-Zippin theorem just provides (see Prop. 3.1) a new characterization of $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces.

Returning to the problem of identification of $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces, it is clear that complemented subspaces of $C(K)$ -spaces and separably injective spaces are $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces. By

the way, we will show which is perhaps the first example of a separably injective space not complemented in any $C(K)$ -space. The previous examples do not exhaust the class of $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces: we shall show that $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces not containing c_0 , the new exotic $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces constructed in [6], the quotients of $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces by separably injective subspaces and the c_0 -vector sums of *uniformly* $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces are $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces.

In Section 4 we tackle the 3-space problem for the class of $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces, which needs the development of a new method of proof and new characterizations of $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces. Section 5 contains further remarks, examples and open problems.

2. ON THE STABILITY OF $C(K)$ -TRIVIAL SEQUENCES BY AMALGAMS AND DUALITY

To carry on our study on the stability of $C(K)$ -trivial sequences we need to know their behavior with respect to the basic homological pull-back and push-out constructions.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a class of Banach spaces.*

- (1) *A pull-back sequence of an $\mathcal{A}$ -trivial sequence is $\mathcal{A}$ -trivial.*
- (2) *If F is an $\mathcal{A}$ -trivial sequence and ϕ is a surjective operator then the push-out sequence ϕF is $\mathcal{A}$ -trivial.*

Proof. The first assertion is obvious. The second is consequence of the next lemma. □

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a class of Banach spaces. Consider the completed push-out diagram of Banach spaces*

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & B & = & B & & \\
 & & \downarrow a & & \downarrow b & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{j} & X & \longrightarrow & Z \longrightarrow 0 \equiv F \\
 & & \downarrow c & & \downarrow d & & \parallel \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & C & \xrightarrow{i} & D & \longrightarrow & Z \longrightarrow 0 \equiv G \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \\
 & & H & & V & &
 \end{array}$$

- i) *V and G are $\mathcal{A}$ -trivial if and only if F and H are $\mathcal{A}$ -trivial.*
- ii) *If F is $\mathcal{A}$ -trivial then G is $\mathcal{A}$ -trivial; if V is $\mathcal{A}$ -trivial, H is $\mathcal{A}$ -trivial.*

Proof. The second part of assertion *ii*) follows from (1) in the previous Proposition 2.1. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and notice that from the diagram in the hypothesis it is immediate the construction of the commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
 & & \mathcal{L}(B, A) & = & \mathcal{L}(B, A) & & \\
 & & \uparrow b^* & & \uparrow a^* & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{L}(Z, A) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{L}(X, A) & \xrightarrow{j^*} & \mathcal{L}(Y, A) \longrightarrow \\
 & & \parallel & & \uparrow d^* & & \uparrow c^* \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{L}(Z, A) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{L}(D, A) & \xrightarrow{i^*} & \mathcal{L}(C, A) \longrightarrow \\
 & & & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0.
 \end{array}$$

Now, the first part of *ii*) can be easily obtained chasing the diagram while *i*) follows simply observing that the restriction operators b^* and i^* are surjective if and only if j^* and a^* are surjective. $\square$

Remark. Pełczyński's Proposition 2.6 of [28] can be considered a rudimentary version of this principle.

Returning to more classical terms, it is especially interesting for us the characterization of $C(K)$ -trivial extensions that Zippin formulates and proves in [31].

Lemma 2. *A sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{j} X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ is $(\lambda, C(K))$ -trivial if and only if there is a w^* -continuous map $\omega : B_{Y^*} \rightarrow \lambda B_{X^*}$ such that $j^*\omega = id$.*

The map ω shall be called a λ - w^* -selector for j^* . Zippin [32, 33] uses this criterion to obtain different proofs of the Lindenstrauss-Pełczyński theorem. It is inspired by the most natural possible situation: the sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{\delta_Y} C(B_{Y^*}) \rightarrow C(B_{Y^*})/Y \rightarrow 0 \equiv \mathbb{C}_Y$, in which $\delta_Y : Y \rightarrow C(B_{Y^*})$ is the canonical embedding, is $(1, C(K))$ -trivial; indeed, the map $\omega : B_{Y^*} \rightarrow B_{C(B_{Y^*})}$ defined as $\omega(x^*)(f) = f(x^*)$ is a 1 - w^* -selector for δ_Y^* . Let us remark that every $C(K)$ -trivial sequence is a pull-back of $\mathbb{C}_Y$ and conversely.

It shall be useful to notice that some properties of the w^* -topology in l_p , $1 \leq p \leq \infty$, pass to l_p -vector sums of Banach spaces. Given an l_p -sum $l_p(X_n)$ we denote $\pi_j : l_p(X_n) \rightarrow X_j$ the natural projections.

Lemma 3. *Let $(E_n^*)_n$ be a sequence of dual spaces and let $(x_k)_k$ be a bounded sequence in $l_p(E_n^*)$, $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. The sequence $(x_k)_k$ is w^* -null if and only if the sequences $(\pi_j(x_k))_k$ are w^* -null.*

Proof. It is clear that if (x_k) is w^* -null, the sequences $(\pi_j(x_k))_k$ are also w^* -null. Conversely, let x be an element of $l_{p^*}(E_n^*)$ –we understand $l_1(E_n^*)$ (resp. $c_0(E_n^*)$) when $p = \infty$ (resp. $p = 1$)– that we write as $x = \lim s_n$ in such a way that (s_n) are finitely supported (that is, $\pi_j(s_n) = 0$ except for a finite quantity of indices j). If for all j the sequence $(\pi_j(x_k))_k$ is w^* -null in E_j , fixed $\varepsilon/2 > 0$, there exist $N_1 > 0$ and $N_2 > 0$ such that for all $n > N_1$ one has $|x_k(x - s_n)| \leq \varepsilon/2$, and for all $k > N_2$ one has $|x_k(s_n)| \leq \varepsilon/2$. Thus, $|x_k(p)| \leq \varepsilon$. $\square$

Given a family of exact sequences $0 \rightarrow A_n \rightarrow B_n \rightarrow C_n \rightarrow 0 \equiv F_n$, we call $0 \rightarrow l_p(A_n) \rightarrow l_p(B_n) \rightarrow l_p(C_n) \rightarrow 0 \equiv l_p(F_n)$ the l_p -amalgam of $(F_n)_n$, for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Analogously, the c_0 -amalgam of (F_n) shall be denoted $c_0(F_n)$. One has:

Proposition 2.2. *The c_0 - and l_p -amalgams of $(\lambda, C(K))$ -trivial exact sequences, $1 \leq p < \infty$, are $(\lambda, C(K))$ -trivial.*

Proof. For each n , let $\omega_n : B_{A_n^*} \rightarrow \lambda B_{B_n^*}$ be a λ - w^* -selector for j_n^* . If we have the l_p -amalgam

$$0 \longrightarrow l_p(A_n) \xrightarrow{\chi} l_p(B_n) \longrightarrow l_p(C_n) \longrightarrow 0 \equiv l_p(F_n),$$

it follows from Lemma 3 that the map $\Omega : B_{l_{p^*}(A_n^*)} \rightarrow \lambda B_{l_{p^*}(B_n^*)}$ defined by $\Omega[(a_n^*)] = [\omega_n(a_n^*)]$ is a λ - w^* -selector for χ^* . $\square$

The situation for l_∞ -amalgams is entirely different because a subspace X of l_∞ can only be $C(K)$ -complemented if it enjoys the Dunford-Pettis and the Grothendieck character of l_∞ : indeed, every operator defined on X with separable range must be weakly compact, and thus every weakly compact operator $X \rightarrow c_0$ must be completely continuous. This means that, subspaces such as $l_\infty(l_2^n)$ cannot be $C(K)$ -complemented in l_∞ and therefore the l_∞ -amalgam of the sequences

$$0 \longrightarrow l_2^n \longrightarrow l_\infty^{m(n)} \longrightarrow l_\infty^{m(n)}/l_2^n \longrightarrow 0$$

in which the embeddings are $(1 + \varepsilon)$ -isometries cannot be $C(K)$ -trivial. Those sequences are $((1 + \varepsilon)^2, C(K))$ -trivial by the existence of the Bartle-Graves continuous selection.

Later on we shall also show that the c_0 -amalgam of $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -trivial sequences is not necessarily $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -trivial. Our concern now is to study the stability of $C(K)$ -trivial sequences by duality. Let us start observing that, for every subspace H of c_0 and every separably Banach space S , the sequence $0 \rightarrow H \rightarrow X \rightarrow S \rightarrow 0 \equiv F$ is $C(K)$ -trivial as well as its dual F^* . That F is $C(K)$ -trivial was observed by Lindenstrauss and Pełczyński in [23, Cor. 2]. The assertion about F^* (actually, that every exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow H^* \rightarrow 0$ is $C(K)$ -trivial for every subspace

H of c_0) directly follows from the equality $\text{Ext}(H^*, C(K)) = 0$, which is implied by the Johnson-Zippin theorem. It is not true, in general, that the dual or bidual of a $C(K)$ -trivial sequence is $C(K)$ -trivial:

Examples. Consider the $C(K)$ -trivial sequence $0 \rightarrow l_2 \xrightarrow{\delta} C(B_{l_2}) \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 0 \equiv F$. We claim that the dual sequence $0 \rightarrow Q^* \rightarrow L_1 \xrightarrow{\delta^*} l_2 \rightarrow 0 \equiv F^*$ cannot be $C(K)$ -trivial. So, assume it to be otherwise. Consider a projective presentation of l_2

$$0 \longrightarrow K(l_2) \longrightarrow l_1 \longrightarrow l_2 \longrightarrow 0 \equiv P.$$

The space $K(l_2)$ is complemented in its bidual as it was proved by Kalton and Pełczyński in [17]. Hence $\text{Ext}(L_1, K(l_2)) = 0$ using Lindenstrauss's lifting principle. Thus, the lower pull-back sequence in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & K(l_2) & \longrightarrow & l_1 & \longrightarrow & l_2 & \longrightarrow & 0 \equiv P \\ & & \parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \delta^* & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K(l_2) & \longrightarrow & PB & \longrightarrow & L_1 & \longrightarrow & 0 \equiv P\delta^* \end{array}$$

splits, and therefore the quotient map $L_1 \rightarrow l_2$ can be lifted to l_1 . This lifting can be chosen so that its restriction to Q^* gives a surjective operator $\phi : Q^* \rightarrow K(l_2)$. In this way $P \equiv \phi F^*$ (see also [9]) and P a push-out of F^* . So, it must be $C(K)$ -trivial. If a projective presentation P of l_2 is $C(K)$ -trivial then $\text{Ext}(l_2, C(K)) = 0$. But it was proved by Kalton in [19], see also [6], that $\text{Ext}(l_2, C[0, 1]) \neq 0$. The bidual sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow l_2 \longrightarrow I \longrightarrow Q^{**} \longrightarrow 0 \equiv F^{**}$$

cannot be $C(K)$ -trivial neither: since I is injective, every operator $I \rightarrow C(B_{l_2})$ is weakly compact, hence completely continuous; thus, the canonical inclusion $l_2 \rightarrow C(B_{l_2})$ cannot be extended to I . Another example is provided by sequences having the form

$$0 \longrightarrow c_0(A_n) \longrightarrow c_0(l_\infty^{m(n)}) \longrightarrow c_0(C_n) \longrightarrow 0 \equiv F;$$

they satisfy that F and F^* do $C(K)$ -split although F^{**} does not necessarily $C(K)$ -split.

3. ON BANACH SPACES OF LINDENSTRAUSS-PEŁCZYŃSKI TYPE

There is an obvious difference between the Lindenstrauss-Pełczyński and the Johnson-Zippin theorems. While the former asserts that every sequence $0 \rightarrow H \rightarrow c_0 \rightarrow c_0/H \rightarrow 0 \equiv F$ is $C(K)$ -trivial the latter establishes that the dual sequence F^* is $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -trivial. Let us see that the class $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ cannot be enlarged, obtaining in this form a new characterization of $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces.

Proposition 3.1. *For a Banach space E the following are equivalent:*

- (1) E is an $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -space.

- (2) Every E -valued operator defined on a $w(l_1, c_0)$ -closed subspace of l_1 can be extended to l_1 .

Proof. It is well-known that (2) can be written as: $\text{Ext}(H^*, E) = 0$ for every subspace H of c_0 . Using again the decomposition $0 \rightarrow c_0(A_n) \rightarrow H \rightarrow c_0(B_n) \rightarrow 0$, where A_n, B_n are finite-dimensional spaces, plus a simple 3-space argument (see [6, Cor. 1.2]), the previous condition is equivalent to: $\text{Ext}(l_1(G_n), E) = 0$ for every sequence (G_n) of finite dimensional spaces. It was already observed by Johnson [11] that a sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0 \equiv F$ locally splits if and only if $FT \equiv 0$ for every operator $T : l_1(G_n) \rightarrow Z$, with G_n finite-dimensional. So, every sequence $0 \rightarrow E \rightarrow X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ locally splits and in particular it does any sequence $0 \rightarrow E \rightarrow l_\infty(I) \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 0 \equiv G$. Recall from [18] that an exact sequence F locally splits if and only if F^{**} splits. Hence, the bidual sequence G^{**} splits, E^{**} must be complemented in an $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -space and E must be itself an $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -space. $\square$

Not entirely trivial is the observation that condition (2) can be replaced by (2') For every set Γ , every E -valued operator defined on a $w(l_1(\Gamma), c_0(\Gamma))$ -closed subspace of $l_1(\Gamma)$ can be extended to $l_1(\Gamma)$. The proof only requires to take in consideration the decomposition lemma of [14].

The situation outlined for $w^*(l_1, c_0)$ -closed subspaces of l_1 , together with the Lindenstrauss-Pelczyński's remark in [23] asserting that operators with range isometric preduals of L_1 extend from subspaces of c_0 to the whole space, suggest to investigate how much the class of $C(K)$ -spaces can be enlarged in the Lindenstrauss-Pelczyński theorem.

Definition 2 (Spaces of Lindenstrauss-Pelczyński type). *We shall say that a Banach space E is a Lindenstrauss-Pelczyński space, in short an $\mathcal{LP}$ space, if all operators from subspaces of c_0 into E can be extended to c_0 .*

We shall also need the quantitative version: when every operator $T : H \rightarrow E$ admits an extension $\hat{T} : c_0 \rightarrow E$ such that $\|\hat{T}\| \leq \lambda\|T\|$ we shall say that E is an $\mathcal{LP}_\lambda$ space. It is not hard to see that every $\mathcal{LP}$ space is an $\mathcal{LP}_\lambda$ space for some λ .

Lemma 4. *Every $\mathcal{LP}_\lambda$ space is an $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, 2\lambda}$ space.*

Proof. Let E be an $\mathcal{LP}_\lambda$ space. Let $T : Y \rightarrow E$ be a compact operator from a subspace Y of a separable space X . Then T factorizes as through some subspace $i : H \rightarrow c_0$ as $T = BA$ with $A : Y \rightarrow H$ and $B : H \rightarrow E$. By definition, there is an extension $B_1 : c_0 \rightarrow E$ of B with $\|B_1\| \leq \lambda\|B\|$; while Sobczyk's theorem gives an extension $A_1 : X \rightarrow c_0$ of iA with $\|A_1\| \leq 2\|iA\|$. The composition $B_1A_1 : X \rightarrow E$ extends T and verifies $\|B_1A_1\| \leq 2\lambda\|T\|$. Using Lindenstrauss's characterization [21], E must be an $\mathcal{L}_{\infty, 2\lambda}$ space. $\square$

The converse fails: we show that not every $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ space is an $\mathcal{LP}$ space. This solves Zippin's Problem 6.15 in [34]. The example (which was sketched in [7]) is based on the Bourgain-Pisier construction [3] which shows that for every separable Banach space X there is an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}_\infty(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{L}_\infty(X)/X \longrightarrow 0,$$

in which $\mathcal{L}_\infty(X)$ is a separable $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -space and $\mathcal{L}_\infty(X)/X$ has the Schur property.

Proposition 3.2. *Let H be a subspace of c_0 such that c_0/H is not isomorphic to c_0 . Then $\mathcal{L}_\infty(H)$ is not an $\mathcal{LP}$ space.*

Proof. Let us consider a sequence $0 \rightarrow H \xrightarrow{j} c_0 \rightarrow c_0/H \rightarrow 0 \equiv F$. Let $0 \rightarrow H \xrightarrow{i} \mathcal{L}_\infty(H) \rightarrow S \rightarrow 0 \equiv \mathcal{H}_\infty$ be the Bourgain-Pisier sequence. Assume that i extends to c_0 through j , so that F is a pull-back of $\mathcal{H}_\infty$. By Sobczyk's theorem, $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ is a pull-back of F . Applying the first diagonal principle of [24] one gets an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{L}_\infty(H) \oplus c_0/H \simeq c_0 \oplus S$$

In particular, c_0/H is a complemented subspace of $c_0 \oplus S$. Since S and c_0 are totally incomparable by the Schur property of S the decomposition theorem of Edelstein-Wojtaszczyk again (see [25, Theorem 2.c.13]) ensures that c_0/H is isomorphic to some $A \oplus B$ with A complemented in c_0 and B complemented in S . Since c_0/H is a subspace of c_0 , B can only be finite dimensional, hence $c_0/H \simeq c_0$, against the hypothesis. $\square$

This example immediately implies

Example. *The c_0 -amalgam of $(\mu, \mathcal{L}_\infty)$ -trivial sequences is not necessarily $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -trivial.*

Proof. General structure results of Johnson-Rosenthal and Zippin (see [25, 1.g.2 and 2.d.1]) imply that given a subspace H of c_0 there exist sequences (A_n) and (B_n) of finite dimensional spaces such that there is an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow c_0(A_n) \rightarrow H \rightarrow c_0(B_n) \rightarrow 0$. There is little doubt that exact sequences $0 \rightarrow A_n \rightarrow l_\infty^{m(n)} \rightarrow C_n \rightarrow 0$ are $(\lambda, \mathcal{L}_{\infty, \lambda})$ -trivial. If all the amalgams $0 \rightarrow c_0(A_n) \rightarrow c_0(l_\infty^{m(n)}) \rightarrow c_0(C_n) \rightarrow 0$ were $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -trivial then every sequence $0 \rightarrow H \rightarrow c_0 \rightarrow c_0/H \rightarrow 0$ should also be

$\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -trivial: indeed, there would be a complete push-out diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& 0 & & 0 & & & \\
& \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & \\
& c_0(A_n) & = & c_0(A_n) & & & \\
& \downarrow a & & \downarrow i & & & \\
0 \longrightarrow & H & \xrightarrow{j} & c_0 & \longrightarrow & c_0/H & \longrightarrow 0 \equiv F \\
& \downarrow b & & \downarrow c & & \parallel & \\
0 \longrightarrow & c_0(B_n) & \xrightarrow{d} & Z & \longrightarrow & Z/c_0(B_n) & \longrightarrow 0 \equiv bF \\
& \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & \\
& 0 & & 0 & & & \\
& \parallel & & \parallel & & & \\
& Vd & & V, & & &
\end{array}$$

to which we apply i) of Lemma 1: if V and bF are $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -trivial then F is $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -trivial (which we know it is not). It remains to check that V and bF are $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -trivial. The sequence V is $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -trivial by our assumption and the Lindenstrauss-Rosenthal theorem that asserts that c_0 is automorphic (see [24, 9]); i.e., there exists an isomorphism $\tau : c_0 \rightarrow c_0$ making a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 \longrightarrow & c_0(A_n) & \longrightarrow & c_0 & \longrightarrow & Z & \longrightarrow 0 \\
& \parallel & & \downarrow \tau & & \downarrow & \\
0 \longrightarrow & c_0(B_n) & \longrightarrow & c_0(l_\infty^{m(n)}) & \longrightarrow & c_0(l_\infty^{m(n)}/A_n) & \longrightarrow 0
\end{array}$$

and therefore the two sequences $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -split simultaneously. The sequence bF is $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -trivial with essentially the same arguments taking into account that Z must be a subspace of c_0 . $\square$

The problem of identifying $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces is still far from being solved, and it actually gives rise to interesting questions. Observe that, in addition to $C(K)$ -spaces, it is clear that complemented subspaces of $C(K)$ -spaces and separably injective spaces are also $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces. The reader might be surprised by the distinction between the two, especially regarding the fact that every injective space is complemented in some $C(K)$ -space. Let us show that the distinction is necessary.

Proposition 3.3. *There exists a separably injective space that is not complemented in any $C(K)$ -space.*

Proof. Let us consider the pull-back diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & c_0 & \longrightarrow & l_\infty & \longrightarrow & l_\infty/c_0 \longrightarrow 0 \equiv \mathcal{I} \\
 & & \parallel & & \uparrow & & \uparrow_{\lambda \cdot 1} \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & c_0 & \longrightarrow & P(\lambda) & \longrightarrow & l_\infty/c_0 \longrightarrow 0 \equiv \mathcal{I}_\lambda.
 \end{array}$$

Benyamini shows in [1] that $P(\lambda)$ is not less than λ^{-1} -complemented in any $C(K)$ -space. Thus, the c_0 -amalgam of the family $(\mathcal{I}_{n^{-1}})$

$$0 \longrightarrow c_0(c_0) \longrightarrow c_0(P(n^{-1})) \longrightarrow c_0(l_\infty/c_0) \longrightarrow 0 \equiv c_0(\mathcal{I}_{n^{-1}})$$

provides an exact sequence in which both $c_0(c_0)$ as well as $c_0(l_\infty/c_0)$ are $C(K)$ -spaces. However, the space $c_0(P(n^{-1}))$ cannot be complemented in any $C(K)$ -space. That c_0 is separably injective is precisely Sobczyk's theorem. That l_∞/c_0 is separably injective is well known and follows from Proposition 4.2 below. It was shown in [12, 30] that when X is separably injective then $c_0(X)$ is separably injective as well. Finally, separable injectivity is a 3-space property (see [6, Cor. 1.2]). $\square$

There are other $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces. As we mentioned before, according to [23, remark 2, p.234], isometric preduals of L_1 are $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces. So, it is quite natural to ask whether the previous classes (namely: complemented subspaces of a $C(K)$ -space, separably injective spaces and isometric preduals of L_1) exhaust the $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces. The answer is no.

Proposition 3.4. *Every $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -space not containing c_0 is an $\mathcal{LP}$ space.*

Proof. Let X be a Banach space. It is not difficult to see that when Y contains no copy of c_0 then every operator $X \rightarrow Y$ is unconditionally converging (see [10]). As it is well known, every subspace H of c_0 has Pełczyński property (V), which means that every unconditionally converging operator $H \rightarrow X$ is weakly compact. Since H^* is Schur, every weakly compact operator $H \rightarrow X$ must be compact; hence, when Y contains no copy of c_0 every operator $H \rightarrow Y$ must be compact. Using Lindenstrauss's extension theorem for compact operators [21], the result follows. $\square$

By a result of Johnson and Zippin [13] separable isometric L_1 -preduals are quotients of $C[0, 1]$. Observe that the $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces not containing c_0 cannot be quotients of $C(K)$ -spaces. Concrete examples of $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces not containing c_0 can be obtained applying the Bourgain-Pisier construction $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\infty(X) \rightarrow S \rightarrow 0$ to spaces X without copies of c_0 by a simple 3-space argument (see [8]).

Recall (see [8]) that a property P is said to be a 3-space property if whenever the spaces Y and Z in an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ have P then also X has P . New classes of $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces can be obtained showing that this class satisfies the 3-space property.

4. THE 3-SPACE PROBLEM FOR $\mathcal{LP}$ SPACES

The purpose of this section is to show:

Theorem 2. *The class of $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces has the 3-space property.*

The proof however is not simple and requires both a different characterization of $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces and a new method to obtain 3-space properties. We assume from the reader some acquaintance with the theory of operator ideals such as developed by Pietsch in [29]. Recall that an operator ideal $\mathfrak{A}$ is said to be surjective (see [29, 4.7.9]) if whenever Q is a quotient map and $TQ \in \mathfrak{A}$ imply $T \in \mathfrak{A}$; dually, the ideal $\mathfrak{A}$ is injective (see [29, 4.6.9]) if whenever J is an into isomorphism and $JT \in \mathfrak{A}$ imply $T \in \mathfrak{A}$. Let us consider the operator ideal $\mathfrak{J}_0$ of those operators that factorize through a subspace of c_0 .

Proposition 4.1. *A Banach space E is an $\mathcal{LP}$ space if and only if the functor $\mathfrak{J}_0(\cdot, E)$ is exact when acting on the category of separable Banach spaces.*

Proof. Let $j : Y \rightarrow X$ be an into isomorphism, and let $T \in \mathfrak{J}_0(Y, E)$. Assume that $T = RS$ with $S \in \mathfrak{L}(Y, H)$, $R \in \mathfrak{L}(H, E)$ and $i : H \rightarrow c_0$ an into isomorphism. The operator R can be extended to an operator $R_1 : c_0 \rightarrow E$ through i since E is an $\mathcal{LP}$ -space; while Sobczyk's theorem allows one to extend $iS : Y \rightarrow c_0$ to an operator $S_1 : X \rightarrow c_0$ through j . All together provides an extension R_1S_1 of T through j . The other implication is immediate. $\square$

The new method to obtain 3-space properties is the following.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a surjective and injective operator ideal. The class of all Banach spaces E such that the functor $\mathfrak{A}(\cdot, E)$ is exact has the 3-space property.*

Proof. The surjectivity of $\mathfrak{A}$ yields that given an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{j} X \xrightarrow{q} Z \rightarrow 0$ and a given space E the induced sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathfrak{A}(Z, E) \xrightarrow{q^*} \mathfrak{A}(X, E) \xrightarrow{j^*} \mathfrak{A}(Y, E)$$

is exact. Now, let

$$0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{i} B \xrightarrow{p} C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an exact sequence. By assumption, both $\mathfrak{A}(\cdot, A)$ and $\mathfrak{A}(\cdot, C)$ are exact functors and we need to prove that also $\mathfrak{A}(\cdot, B)$ is exact. To this end we construct the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& 0 & & 0 & & 0 & \\
& \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{A}(Z, A) & \xrightarrow{q^*} & \mathfrak{A}(X, A) & \xrightarrow{j^*} & \mathfrak{A}(Y, A) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{A}(Y, A)/j^*(\mathfrak{A}(X, A)) \\
& i^* \downarrow & & i^* \downarrow & & i^* \downarrow & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{A}(Z, B) & \xrightarrow{q^*} & \mathfrak{A}(X, B) & \xrightarrow{j^*} & \mathfrak{A}(Y, B) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{A}(Y, B)/j^*(\mathfrak{A}(X, B)) \\
& p^* \downarrow & & p^* \downarrow & & p^* \downarrow & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathfrak{A}(Z, C) & \xrightarrow{q^*} & \mathfrak{A}(X, C) & \xrightarrow{j^*} & \mathfrak{A}(Y, C) \longrightarrow \mathfrak{A}(Y, C)/j^*(\mathfrak{A}(X, C)).
\end{array}$$

The rows are exact by the surjectivity of $\mathfrak{U}$, while the columns are also exact by injectivity of $\mathfrak{U}$. By hypothesis,

$$\mathfrak{A}(Y, A)/j^*(\mathfrak{A}(X, A)) = \mathfrak{A}(Y, C)/j^*(\mathfrak{A}(X, C)) = 0$$

and the exactness of the fourth column implies that

$$\mathfrak{A}(Y, B)/j^*(\mathfrak{A}(X, B)) = 0,$$

hence $\mathfrak{A}(\cdot, B)$ is exact. $\square$

Since the separability assumption of the previous characterization of $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces does not affect the method of Proposition 4.1, the proof of Theorem 2 will be complete after showing:

Lemma 1. *The ideal $\mathfrak{J}_0$ is injective and surjective.*

Proof. The injectivity is a direct consequence of the definition. To show the surjectivity, let $\tau : X \rightarrow E$ be an operator which factorizes as $\tau = \varphi_0 \varphi_1$ through a subspace H of c_0 in a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{j} & X & \xrightarrow{p} & Z \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & & & \downarrow \varphi_1 & & \\
& & & & H & & \\
& & & & \downarrow \varphi_0 & & \\
& & & & E & &
\end{array}$$

Assume that $\tau j = 0$. One then has the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \xrightarrow{j} & X & \xrightarrow{p} & Z & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \varphi_1 & & \downarrow \tilde{\varphi}_1 & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker \varphi_0 & \longrightarrow & H & \xrightarrow{P} & H/\ker \varphi_0 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & & & \downarrow \varphi_0 & & & & \\
 & & & & E & & & &
 \end{array}$$

It is clear that there exists an operator $\tilde{\varphi}_0 : H/\ker \varphi_0 \rightarrow E$ such that $\tilde{\varphi}_0 P = \varphi_0$. It is then obvious that $\tilde{\varphi}_0 \tilde{\varphi}_1 p = \varphi_0 \varphi_1$. Moreover the operator $\tilde{\varphi}_0 \tilde{\varphi}_1 \in \mathfrak{I}_0(Z, E)$ since $H/\ker \varphi_0$, as a quotient of a subspace of c_0 , is itself a subspace of c_0 (see [25]). $\square$

Theorem 2, in particular, yields:

Corollary 1. *Every twisted sum of $C(K)$ -spaces is an $\mathcal{LP}$ -space.*

The paper [6, Thm. 2.3] contains most of the available information about how to construct twisted sums of $C(K)$ -spaces. For instance, it is shown that for every separable Banach space X not containing l_1 there exists an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow C[0, 1] \xrightarrow{i} \Omega(X) \xrightarrow{q} X \longrightarrow 0$$

with strictly singular quotient map. Of course, the space $\Omega(X)$ is not a quotient of a $C(K)$ -space. Using Theorem 4.7 in [6] one can obtain examples of $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces not containing l_1 which are not $C(K)$ -spaces. We do not know if there exist $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces not containing l_1 which are not $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces. See also Question 1 in Section 4.

Moving to the nonseparable spaces, new $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces can be obtained through the following stability result.

Proposition 4.2. *Every quotient of an $\mathcal{LP}$ space by a separably injective space is an $\mathcal{LP}$ space.*

Proof. Let us consider an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow SI \rightarrow \mathcal{LP} \xrightarrow{q} Q \rightarrow 0$ in which the middle space is a Lindenstrauss-Pełczyński space and the subspace is separably injective. Let $\phi : H \rightarrow Q$ be an operator from a subspace H of c_0 . Since SI is separably injective, $\text{Ext}(H, SI) = 0$. Hence $F\phi$ splits and ϕ can be lifted through q to an operator $\psi : H \rightarrow \mathcal{LP}$. This operator can be extended to an operator $\Psi : c_0 \rightarrow \mathcal{LP}$. The operator $q\Psi : c_0 \rightarrow Q$ is the desired extension of ϕ . $\square$

The same proof provides that the quotient of two separably injective spaces is separably injective. In particular, l_∞/c_0 is separably injective. We would like to mention one more stability result. Being obvious that l_∞ -vector sums of sequences

of $\mathcal{LP}_\lambda$ spaces are $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces, the corresponding result for c_0 -vector sums keeps being true. Details shall appear elsewhere.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $\lambda \geq 1$. The c_0 -vector sum of a sequence of $\mathcal{LP}_\lambda$ spaces is an $\mathcal{LP}$ space.*

5. SOME OPEN QUESTIONS

Regarding the stability result in Proposition 4.2 it seems quite natural to ask:

Question 1. Is the quotient of two $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces an $\mathcal{LP}$ space?

An affirmative answer to Question 1 would imply that separable $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces not containing l_1 are $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces. Two particularly interesting quotients of two $\mathcal{LP}$ -spaces are remarked in the next question.

Question 2. Is $l_\infty/C[0, 1]$ an $\mathcal{LP}$ space? Must $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces which are quotients of $C[0, 1]$ be $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces?

As we have already mentioned in the introduction, Johnson and Zippin proved in [14] that every extension $0 \rightarrow H \rightarrow c_0(\Gamma) \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ is $C(K)$ -trivial. It will be nice to know if $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces can play the role of $C(K)$ -spaces in this result.

Question 3. Given a subspace H of $c_0(\Gamma)$, does every operator $H \rightarrow \mathcal{LP}$ have an extension to $c_0(\Gamma)$?

Needless to say, the extension property one would like to get from $\mathcal{LP}$ spaces is: every $C(K)$ -trivial sequence is also $\mathcal{LP}$ -trivial. Unfortunately, this does not hold.

Example. We already know that the Bourgain-Pisier space $\mathcal{L}_\infty(l_2)$ is an $\mathcal{LP}$ space. Consider then the sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & l_2 & \xrightarrow{\delta_2} & C(B_{l_2}) & \longrightarrow & Q \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & \parallel & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & l_2 & \xrightarrow{j} & \mathcal{L}_\infty(l_2) & \longrightarrow & S \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

If j could be extended to an operator $J : C(B_{l_2}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_\infty(l_2)$ through δ_2 this would be a weakly compact operator since $\mathcal{L}_\infty(l_2)$ does not contain c_0 . Hence J would be completely continuous by the Dunford-Pettis property of $C(K)$ -spaces. It is therefore impossible that $J\delta_2 = j$.

The method of proof developed in Proposition 4.1 is new. It is moreover clear that it can be applied to other injective and surjective operator ideals appearing in the literature. The following ideals are injective and surjective (see [29]) $\mathfrak{L}$ = all operators; $\mathfrak{F}$ = finite rank operators; $\mathfrak{K}$ = compact operators; $\mathfrak{W}$ = weakly compact operators; $\mathfrak{U}$ = unconditionally summing operators; $\mathfrak{J}_2$ = operators factorable through a Hilbert space. Let us introduce some notation: given an injective and surjective operator ideal $\mathfrak{U}$ let $E(\mathfrak{U})$ be the class of all Banach spaces E such that the functor $\mathfrak{U}(\cdot, E)$. From Proposition 4.1 we have obtained easy proofs that the

following classes have the 3-space property: $E(\mathfrak{L}) =$ injective spaces; applying the method only to separable spaces one obtains the class of separably injective spaces; $E(\mathfrak{K}) = \mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces (by [21]); $E(\mathfrak{M}) = \mathfrak{L}_\infty$ -spaces with the Schur property (shown in [2]). The classes $E(\mathfrak{U})$ and $E(\mathfrak{J}_2)$ seem not have been characterized yet.

A simple homological duality argument yields:

Proposition 5.1. *Let $\mathfrak{A}$ be a injective and surjective operator ideal. The class of all Banach spaces E such that the functor $\mathfrak{A}(E, \cdot)$ is exact has the 3-space property.*

If we call $\exists(\mathfrak{A})$ the previous class determined by the ideal $\mathfrak{A}$ then the only non-trivial case identified is $\exists(\mathfrak{K}) = \mathcal{L}_1$ -spaces.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Benyamini, *An M -space which is not isomorphic to a $C(K)$ -space*, Israel Journal of Mathematics 28 (1977) 98-102.
- [2] J. Bourgain and F. Delbaen, *A class of special $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces*, Acta Math. 145 (1980) 155-176.
- [3] J. Bourgain and G. Pisier, *A construction of $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces and related Banach spaces*, Boletim da Sociedade Brasileira de Matematica. 14 (1983) 109-123.
- [4] F. Cabello Sánchez and J.M.F. Castillo, *Duality and twisted sums of Banach spaces*, Journal of Functional Analysis 175 (2000) 1-16.
- [5] F. Cabello Sánchez and J.M.F. Castillo, *Uniform boundedness and twisted sums of Banach spaces*, Houston Journal of Mathematics 30 (2004) 523-536.
- [6] F. Cabello Sánchez, J.M.F. Castillo, N.J. Kalton and D.T. Yost, *Twisted sums with $C(K)$ spaces*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 355 (2003) 4523-4541.
- [7] F. Cabello Sánchez, J.M.F. Castillo, Y. Moreno, D. Yost, *Extension of $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ -spaces under a twisted light*, in Proceedings of the International Conference dedicated to the 110th anniversary of Stefan Banach, Lviv, Ukraine (A. Plichko and A. Zagorodnyuk eds.) North-Holland Math Studies.
- [8] J.M.F. Castillo and M. González, *Three-space problems in Banach space theory*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1667, Springer-Verlag, 1997.
- [9] J.M.F. Castillo and Y. Moreno, *On the Lindenstrauss-Rosenthal theorem*, Israel Journal of Mathematics 140 (2004) 253-270.
- [10] J. Diestel, H. Jarchow and A. Tonge, *Absolutely summing operators*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 43, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [11] W.B. Johnson, *Extensions of c_0* , Positivity 1 (1997) 55-74.
- [12] W.B. Johnson and T. Oikhberg, *Separable lifting property and extensions of local reflexivity*, Illinois Journal of Mathematics 45 (2001) 123-137.
- [13] W.B. Johnson and M. Zippin, *Separable L_1 preduals are quotients of $C(\Delta)$* , Israel Journal of Mathematics 16 (1973) 198-202.
- [14] W.B. Johnson and M. Zippin, *Extension of operators from subspaces of $c_0(\Gamma)$ into $C(K)$ spaces*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 107 (1989) 751-754.
- [15] W. B. Johnson and M. Zippin, *Extension of operators from weak*-closed subspaces of l_1 into $C(K)$ spaces*, Studia Mathematica 117 (1995) 43-55.
- [16] N.J. Kalton, *The three-space problem for locally bounded F -spaces*, Compositio Mathematica 37 (1978) 243-276.
- [17] N.J. Kalton and N.T. Peck, *Twisted sums of sequence spaces and the three-space problem*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 255 (1979) 1-30.
- [18] N.J. Kalton, *Locally complemented subspaces and $\mathcal{L}_p$ for $p < 1$* , Mathematische Nachrichten 115 (1984), 71-97.
- [19] N.J. Kalton, *On subspaces of c_0 and extension of operators into $C(K)$ -spaces*, Quarterly Journal of Mathematics Oxford 52 (2001), 313-328.

- [20] N.J. Kalton, A. Pełczyński, *Kernels of surjections from $\mathcal{L}_1$ -spaces with an application to Sidon sets*, Mathematische Annalen 309 (1997), 135–158.
- [21] J. Lindenstrauss, *On the extension of compact operators*, Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society 48 (1964).
- [22] J. Lindenstrauss, *On a certain subspace of l_1* , Bulletin of the Polish Academy of Sciences 12 (1964) 539–542.
- [23] J. Lindenstrauss and A. Pełczyński, *Contributions to the theory of the classical Banach spaces*, Journal of Functional Analysis, 8 (1971), 225–249.
- [24] J. Lindenstrauss and H.P. Rosenthal, *Automorphisms in c_0, l_1 and m* , Israel Journal of Mathematics 9 (1969) 227–239.
- [25] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach spaces I, sequence spaces*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete 92, Springer-Verlag 1977.
- [26] S. Mac Lane, *Homology*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 114, Springer-Verlag 1975.
- [27] A. Pełczyński, *Banach spaces on which every unconditionally converging operator is weakly compact*, Bulletin of the Polish Academy of Sciences 10 (1962) 641–648.
- [28] A. Pełczyński *Linear extensions, linear averagings, and their applications to linear topological classification of spaces of continuous functions*, Dissertationes Mathematicae 58, 1968.
- [29] A. Pietsch, *Operator ideals*, North-Holland Mathematical Library, vol. 20, North-Holland.
- [30] H.P. Rosenthal, *The complete separable extension problem*, Journal of Operator Theory 43 (2000) 329–374.
- [31] M. Zippin, *The embedding of Banach spaces into spaces with structure*, Illinois Journal of Mathematics 34 (1990) 586–606.
- [32] M. Zippin, *A global approach to certain operator extension problems*, in Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1470 (1990) 78–84.
- [33] M. Zippin, *Applications of Michael’s continuous selection theorem to operator extension problems*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society 127 (1999) 1371–1378.
- [34] M. Zippin, *Extension of bounded linear operators*, in Handbook of the Geometry of Banach spaces vol 2 (W.B. Johnson and J. Lindenstrauss eds.), Elsevier, 2003; pp. 1703–1741.

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, UNIVERSIDAD DE EXTREMADURA, AVENIDA DE ELVAS, 06071 BADAJOZ, ESPAÑA. E-MAIL ADDRESS: CASTILLO@UNEX.ES; YMORENO@UNEX.ES, JESSUSF@TELEFONICA.NET